

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting
Monday, June 25, 2007**

1. CONVENE: 7:09 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Board member Ezzy Ashcraft
3. ROLL CALL: President Lynch, Vice President Cook, Cunningham, Ezzy Ashcraft, Kohlstrand, and McNamara.

Board member Mariani was absent from roll call.

Also present were Planning Services Manager Andrew Thomas, Assistant City Attorney Donna Mooney, Supervising Planner Doug Garrison.

4. MINUTES:
 - a. Minutes for the Special meeting of May 29, 2007.

Board member Cunningham noted that page 16, Resolution No. 2 should read, "The addition of one more tree is required." Mr. Thomas noted that was being appealed.

Vice President Cook noted that paragraph 6, page 7, read, "Acting President Cook suggested using interpretive signage to help people make their way into the site." She suggested interpretive signage to help people understand the history of the site, and what was previously at the site.

Board member Cunningham moved approval of the minutes as amended.

Vice President Cook seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 5. Abstain – 1 (Lynch). Absent: 1 (Mariani). The motion passed.

- b. Minutes for the meeting of June 11, 2007.

Ms. Mooney wished to clarify that on page 5, she was suggesting that the Board had a number of wording options, including adding the phrase "take equivalent measures."

Board member Cunningham moved approval of the minutes as amended.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 5. Abstain – 1 (McNamara). Absent: 1 (Mariani). The motion passed.

Board member Cunningham inquired whether minutes for the Joint City Council/Planning Board meeting would be available. Mr. Thomas noted that there should be minutes, and that he would follow up on that request.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION: None.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Future Agendas
- b. Zoning Administrator Report

Mr. Thomas provided an update on future agenda items and the Zoning Administrator actions.

Board member Kohlstrand noted that the Measure A subcommittee recommendation to the Planning Board may come back to the Planning Board on July 23, 2007, if a decision was reached on July 13, 2007.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATION:

Ms. Debra Banks, 2137 Otis Drive, noted that she was very concerned about the tipping point regarding the MND Submission for Safeway Gas Station and Convenience Store. She read her written statement into the record:

“We have reached the tipping point for what is needed and what is right for Alameda. The tipping point is that do we sacrifice our fragile environment and critical care facilities for a few more dollars to operate this town.

“I believe that something is not right in the CEQA guideline compliance, and have great concerns about the ramifications of the traffic congestion along with the potential hazards impacting the quality of our air, soils and waters. On April 23, 2007, the Planning staff submitted to the Planning Board a list of potentially significant impacts of this project on the air, soil and water with mitigations.

“Air Quality: construction-related dust has a potentially significant quality impact. The BAAMQD CEQA Guidelines consider potentially significant construction-related dust impacts to be adequately mitigated with the implementation of recommended control measures.

“Geology and Soils: construction-related erosion has a potentially significant impact on water quality... the applicant is to submit an erosion and sediment control plan to the City prior to the issuance of the Building Permits and the implementation of best management practices during the construction phase.

“Hydrology and Water Quality: contaminated storm water runoffs can have a potentially significant impact due to the potential for petroleum product spills and other debris. The applicant is to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.

“Fact: To date there has been no formal study of air quality regarding asbestos, carbon monoxide and gas emissions along the Otis Drive corridor, as well as soil erosion with stormwater runoffs impacting water quality, particularly that of the lagoon opposite of the proposed fuel station. (The lagoon opposite of the Towne Center is already 400% over the upper limit for expected fecal coliform.)

“Fact: There was critical facilities (two respite care homes and a hospital) that will be affected by environmental conditions involving air and water quality.

“Fact: Alameda is approaching the tipping point of endangering its natural and healthy environment at its south shore for trying to recoup revenue leakages.

“Is this best planning practice for a town in such a fragile environment?”

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 8-A. **Use Permit UP07-0010; Minor Design Review MDR 07-0058; Parking In-lieu Fees – Applicant: Gary Parker – 2437 Lincoln (ZS).** The applicant is requesting a Use Permit and Design Review approval to establish a dental office and laboratory on the ground floor of an existing building; reconfigure the parking lot to increase the number of parking spaces from seven to thirteen; and pay parking in-lieu fees for five parking spaces. The property is located within a C-C-T (Community Commercial Theater Combining) zoning district.

Board member Cunningham moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-07-23 to approve a Use Permit and Design Review approval to establish a dental office and laboratory on the ground floor of an existing building; reconfigure the parking lot to increase the number of parking spaces from seven to thirteen; and pay parking in-lieu fees for five parking spaces.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6 Absent: 1 (Mariani). The motion passed.

- 8-B. **UP07-0004 – Jason Chan – 1707 Lincoln Ave (SW).** The applicant requests approval of a Use Permit to modify an existing retail space into a new restaurant with a take-out counter and a total of 40 seats. The property is located within a C-1 Neighborhood Business Zoning District.

Board member Cunningham moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. PB-07-24 to approve a Use Permit to modify an existing retail space into a new restaurant with a take-out counter and a total of 24 seats.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6 Absent: 1 (Mariani). The motion passed.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 9-A. **Initial Study IS05-0001; Planned Development Amendment PDA05-0001; Major Design Review DR05-0010; Use Permits UP06-0003, UP06-0010, UP06-0012 and UP06-0013; – Applicant: Safeway, Inc. 2234 Otis Drive (adjacent Alameda Towne Centre) (DG).** The applicant requests approval of Planned Development Amendment, Major Design Review and Use Permits allowing the demolition of an existing bank building and redevelopment of the property with a gas station. The project includes three covered pump islands, each containing three pumps, for a total of eighteen pumping stations. Fuel will be stored in three 20,000 gallon underground storage tanks. In addition to the approximately 7,500 square-foot canopy covering the gasoline pumping facilities, the project includes an approximately 625 square-foot building, housing the cashier's desk, restrooms and retail sales of convenience items. The applicant is proposing twenty-four hour operations and the sale of beer and wine. An Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project. Mitigation measures have been identified that will reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level. The site is located within a, Central Business District with Planned Development overlay Zoning District (C-2-PD). **(Continued from the meeting of June 11, 2007.)**

President Lynch noted that staff had prepared a set of documents for the Planning Board, and members of the public had wanted to look at those plans the previous week; for a variety of reasons, they were unable to do so.

Mr. Thomas advised that the Planning Board packet contained the staff report, the April 23 staff report, the reduced April 23 plans, and the large set of plans. The website had all of those documents with the exception of the large plans. The public binders contained all of the plan sets.

President Lynch invited Board comment with respect to considering this item at this time, when all members of the public did not have the opportunity to see all of the documents

seen by the Planning Board. He noted that the item could be continued to the next Planning Board meeting since all of the documents were available.

Board member Kohlstrand suggested that it may be a benefit if the applicant made a presentation to enable the Board to choose whether or not to continue the item.

Board member McNamara supported continuing the item until the next meeting, out of respect for full opportunity for the public to review the documents. She noted the applicant presentation would need to be made again at that point.

Board member Cunningham concurred with Board member McNamara's assessment.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Ezzy Ashcraft, Mr. Thomas confirmed that this item was appropriately noticed, and that there was no issue about the availability of the material for the public. He understood that Clare Risley had been handed the public binder, and that there was a miscommunication at that point, resulting in her leaving with the staff report, the old plans, but without a copy of the new plans. He noted that the new, larger plans should have been posted on the website. Staff believed that the Board may move forward if so desired this evening, or continue the item to the next meeting.

Board member Kohlstrand moved to continue this item to the meeting of July 9, 2007.

Board member McNamara seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – Aye: 5 Abstain: 1 (Ezzy Ashcraft). Absent: 1 (Mariani). The motion passed.

9-B. **DP07-0003 - Alameda Landing Mixed Use Development Project – Applicant: Catellus Development Group, a ProLogis Company (AT/DV).** The applicant requests Development Plan and Design Review approval for Phase 1A and 2A retail buildings, off-street parking, landscaping, and associated improvements south of Mitchell Mosely Extension and east of Fifth Street. The site is located along the western end of the former FISC Site (Tract 7884) within the M-X Mixed Use Planned Development Zoning District.

Mr. Thomas summarized the staff report.

Mr. David Tiernan, Senior Vice President, Catellus, Development Group, applicant, introduced the LPA architectural team and described the firm's experience. He believed the plan was consistent with the approved Master Plan in terms of its layout and building placement. He noted that it was a pedestrian- and bike-friendly layout that discouraged the use of the automobile inside the development.

Mr. Rick Damato, Principal design architect, displayed and described the specifics of the plan. He emphasized that the project was designed to respect the environment and Alameda, and that it could begin to teach the community about smart and sustainable design.

Mr. Kevin Sullivan, Principal and landscape architect, displayed and described the retail portion of the Alameda Landing project.

Mr. Rick Damato displayed and described the specifics of the plan in further detail, and noted that there were many opportunities within the project to educate the community about its own history through the use of signage, graphics and information center. The work of local artists would be integrated into the project. He described the lighting design, which would be employ spotlights and other design techniques to avoid the use of standard lighting schemes. He noted that photovoltaic panels will be used in the light towers, which would also be an iconic element of the site. He invited the Board members to walk around the chambers to observe the site planning and architecture displays.

The public hearing was opened.

Ms. Karen Bay noted that she was excited to see more retail on the West End, and liked the design concept which integrated sustainability and reuse of old buildings. She was concerned about the tenant issues, and believed that Bridgeside had provided a lesson for the City. She would like the beauty of the buildings to be enhanced by the right retail tenants. She would like to see the phasing and the tenancing of this project managed together.

President Lynch believed the Planning Board should stay away from the tenant list, and added that the management of the ownership for this project differed from the Bridgeside project. He noted that discussion had taken place for the Bridgeside project, and that the owner that came before the Board was no longer the owner. He believed the management team for this project put a different value in its project, which he believed would be reflected in the tenant mix.

Mr. Tiernan noted that the architecture was only half of the equation; the other half was having a strategy to make the best use of the retail portion of the site.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

Board member Cunningham noted that he liked the site plan, and that it was a lot of merit to it. He believed the circulation was simple with good connectivity between the elements. He inquired whether there was a safe, dedicated area for ride-share users to be picked up. He inquired whether those parking spaces were included in the parking ratio, or whether it was over and above that amount.

Mr. Thomas noted that page A-1.0.1 displayed the site plan of Alameda Landing, which was the more detailed parking plan that showed the count for each parking area.

Vice President Cook stated that the Park and Ride Shelter should be a covered, lighted and safe place.

Board member Cunningham noted that the light towers were an interesting concept that could be a signature element. He wanted to ensure that all of the site was sufficiently lighted, and would like further photometric information.

Mr. Tiernan noted the light towers covered the site, with the exception of the two side parking lots where they would introduce supplemental parking lot light standards. He noted that they provided better lighting coverage than the pools of light typically produced by parking lot lighting. He noted that the standard parking lot lighting would be provided at the edges.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the landscape island adjacent to the ride share program would include the public waiting space.

Board member Cunningham noted that the activation of Fifth Street had been executed very well. He noted that on the public parking side, the main service corridor included trash receptacles and questioned the option to increase total GLA to include retail frontage onto the parking lot. Mr. Thomas replied that the Master Plan limited the amount of retail at Alameda Landing as a whole to 300,000 square feet; the idea of limiting the amount of retail at Alameda Landing was because they wanted to minimize the competition with Webster Street and to maintain some retail capacity at Alameda Point. After many retail studies, the City came to 300,000 square feet as the right amount of retail for Alameda Landing.

In response to an inquiry by President Lynch regarding the consistency of the amount of leeway allowed versus what had been approved at Alameda Landing, Mr. Thomas replied that in terms of the changes of the footprint of the buildings, the design substantially conformed with what the Planning Board had approved. Staff added a condition of approval stating that if the footprint varied by more than 20% in terms of the size of the building, it would be brought back to the Board.

President Lynch noted that he would be open to incorporating the suggestion, and did not think it would substantially damage the retail at Alameda Point or Webster Street if this design element were to be picked up.

Board member Cunningham reflected on past experience of the Bridgeside Center, and did not believe that the goals of the Bridgeside Center were able to be achieved in terms of the tenant spaces. He noted that the pizza restaurant painted their windows white, and the pet shop had placed posters over the windows. He did not believe it had worked out at all as envisioned by the Planning Board, and hoped the Board could learn from trying to be too stringent in trying to strive for a goal with respect to tenant leasing.

Board member McNamara noted that the Planning Board had pushed for a high-end shopping center, which was not the objective of the Bridgeside developers. She wanted to ensure that a solid foundation of office, retail and residential uses would be established in order to support the high-end uses envisioned at the waterfront plaza.

President Lynch noted that often, the plans developed in concept did not work practically. He supported incorporating lessons learned into this project.

Mr. Sullivan noted that they had developed millions of square feet of retail, and they learned that smaller retail tenants tend to feed off each other.. He noted that there were no paseos or pedestrian paths focused on the back of the retail blocks. He noted that the paseos would be very activated, with entries and dining on them, which would naturally drawn people to those spaces. He described the circulation patterns as they envisioned them, and noted that it would much like a typical downtown.

Board member Kohlstrand mentioned Tucker's on Park Street, which also had a courtyard which served as a secondary entrance; she would like that to be an example of the retail use.

Vice President Cook noted that Fourth Street was also a good example, as it had many smaller parking lots in back of the buildings.

Board member Cunningham believed the Planning Board should ensure that the plan supported a strong landscape plan. He would like the detailed planting plan to define how the area would be activated.

Vice President Cook wanted to ensure there would be understory foliage, and she wanted to ensure there would be sufficient landscaping.

Mr. Sullivan noted that it would be incorporated into the site plans; for every fourth palm, there would be a canopy tree along Fifth Street, as well as in all of the pedestrian plazas and parking lot trees.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft wanted to ensure that the college students who may work at the restaurants and the shops were able to get there from the college. She noted that she was concerned with the retail tenantry, as cited on page 3 of the staff report: "The retail centers provides an important market foundation for the future development of the second phase of retail referred to in the Master Plan as the waterfront plaza retail to attract the quality restaurants and specialty retail uses that would make the waterfront plaza a truly unique Alameda location. Alameda Landing needs to first establish a solid foundation of office, retail and residential uses that can support the future "high end" uses envisioned at the waterfront plaza." She believed there was a distinction between high-end and other retail uses in the staff report, and inquired about other high-end retail establishments that may be supported by lower-end establishments. She cited Santana Row in San Jose and Fourth Street in Berkeley were two other retail areas.

Mr. Tiernan noted that their strategy was to create a critical mass of retail as a first phase, and would not characterize it as high-end or low-end. He believed there would be a broad spectrum of retail uses, either local, regional or national. He believed it would increase the value of the retail frontage on the site, and that when the successful flagship tenant (Clif Bar) was established, it would be easier to bring in quality establishments to the site.

President Lynch cautioned against using terms such as high-end and low-end retail establishments, and cited the success of Panda Express, and the fact that Yan Can Cook restaurants are no longer open. He clarified that some individuals would refer to Panda Express as high-end, and that some individuals would refer to Panda Express food as low-end.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Ezzy Ashcraft regarding other examples of this kind of retail mix, Mr. Sullivan noted that the hybrid center was a new concept. Typically, the large format will bring the entertainment to the center of the development, and building out. In this case, Fifth Street would be the entertainment district with the larger format behind it. He cited the Irvine Spectrum Center, as well as downtown Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill.

President Lynch believed it was important to be flexible, and that it was a slippery slope when referring to “high-end” or “low-end.” Mr. Thomas noted that the phrase “high end” was in the staff report and inappropriate. He noted that City Council required a retail leasing strategy before moving forward, which was the plan brought to the EDC for their review and approval. They also had to meet regularly with the Executive Director of the Community Improvement Commission to ensure that when they move through with their leasing, they would be in compliance with that plan and the City’s goals.

Vice President Cook expressed concern that there were no midblock crossings to the College of Alameda, and to the future residential area along the north side, on Mitchell.

Mr. Sullivan noted that there were pedestrian crossings in six locations along Fifth Street. He noted that there were three opportunities for pedestrian crossings along Mitchell.

Vice President Cook believed that the east-west entry along the south side of Building A should remain a street, which should feel like something besides a service entry.

Vice President Cook believed that Building D seemed to be significantly longer than the other buildings, and inquired why it was designed that way.

Mr. Sullivan noted that they were considering splitting that building, depending on the leasing situation; he noted that square footages would be increased in other areas to accommodate that change.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Cook regarding the north-south road option, Mr. Thomas replied that they were in good shape regarding the road between Buildings G and F, the sidewalks on both sides of E and D. He believed that the applicants were willing to add a sidewalk on the southern side of that third east-west road between C and D. Regarding the north-south road in front of Building A, he suggested that the Board ask the team to make the statement regarding the Board’s concerns about the design.

Board member Cunningham suggested that the pedestrian pathway on the side of Building A be given more width to make it a inviting space.

Board member Cunningham wanted to ensure the highest and best use was being addressed, and that the potential 50 feet of asphalt would not interfere with that.

Vice President Cook would like the public right of way to include the sidewalks, and believed it would be good to connect the waterfront residential uses with the College of Alameda at some point in the future.

Board member Kohlstrand resisted the notion of creating more pavement, and noted that was it already paved; she was arguing for a different use of the paved space.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the Board may continue this item with the request that the applicant present three alternative ways to deal with the north-south sidewalk.

President Lynch suggested that the Board members' thoughts be taken and incorporated in order to make a determination.

Mr. Thomas reviewed the conditions of approval to be included. An appropriate place for the pick-up and drop-off being covered and lighted next to the ride share area should be added. The rear sidewalk behind Buildings C and D may have an minimum of five feet of unobstructed space in all places. The landscape plan shall come to the Planning Board for final review and approval. A condition already existed to address the transformers, and that the "big green boxes" and utilities be placed behind the buildings, not in front on Fifth Street. The sidewalk on the south side of Building A should be straightened out for pedestrian use, and a sidewalk would be added on the south side of the road, from Mariners Square to Fifth Street. The north-south sidewalk would be included down the length of the project.

Board member Kohlstrand expressed concern about Condition 7 of the new Draft Resolution and would like to have a representative from Department of Public Works to respond to the concerns.

Mr. Thomas noted that the Department of Public Works was concerned about a potential scenario where they may determine at a future date that the situation was dangerous, which was the reason for the condition as it existed. He noted that any decision to modify this project in the future would have to come back to the Planning Board for review and approval. He suggested following Vice President Cook's suggestion to approve the site plan with the exception of the north-south roadway and the sidewalks, which could be addressed at a future date with Public Works.

Mr. Tiernan noted that they would return with specific plans for Building A, which was 80% of the frontage on the street. Those specific plans could be coupled with various options explored for how to handle the north-south street, and could take place later in the summer.

Vice President Cook moved to adopt Planning Board Resolution No. 07-__ to approve the development plan with the condition outlined by staff and the condition that: Buildings A through H must return for design review;

Board member Cunningham seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Absent: 1 (Mariani). The motion passed.

Board member Cunningham believed the building heights should be defined, and some section profiles should be presented. He expressed concern about the buildings with the billboards on the roof, and would like the design elements to be further articulated and placed on the blank walls on the lower levels, where the pedestrians may see them. He would like to understand more about the significance of the tilt-up elevations from a material point of view, and would like to see a material boards to see relief to the expanse of concrete.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham regarding the recycling of formed concrete, Mr. Sullivan replied that they may cut the concrete into four-foot-wide sections, and bury 2.5 feet of it for 18-inch seat walls. They may also create bases to wood benches, as well as wheel stops.

Board member Cunningham believed the wood trusses were a good idea, and suggested burying them halfway into the ground to allow them to stand up.” He noted that he had tried to reference the point that the Board should look at how they worked structurally, so they could stand up without having to bury them halfway into the ground.

Vice President Cook expressed concern about the color boards, and perceived them as having a very cool palette. She noted that the paseos shown in the slides had brick and a more warm, California theme. She would like to see a warmer, more vibrant color scheme.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Cook regarding the modern signage, Mr. Sullivan replied that employed techniques to highlight the more nostalgic treatments. He noted that they did not reflect the actual content.

Vice President Cook expressed concern that the water towers looked like a power plant to her, and that the façade and the water towers seemed somewhat uncomfortable and ominous.

Board member McNamara agreed with Vice President Cook’s comments about the water towers, and noted that it reminded her of a nuclear reactor.

Board member Ezzy Ashcraft recalled that there had been a water tower at the Base. She noted that in agricultural areas, water towers were prominent features.

President Lynch noted that he liked the water tower as well, and noted that while the colors could be warmed up, this was an industrial reuse.

Board member McNamara liked the proposal, which showed more detail and dimension, and would support staff's recommendation to continue to work on the design of Buildings A and B.

Board member Kohlstrand complimented the applicants on the amount of research they had done, and noted that they made a real effort to be responsive to the community. She believed the acknowledgement of Alameda's history and future was very positive. She agreed with Vice President Cook's comments about the color scheme, and would like to see it warmed up.

Board member Kohlstrand liked the gateway treatment at Stargell and Fifth Street.

A discussion of the site circulation, paseos and the gateway entrance ensued. The discussion addressed the establishment of public streets in this development, as opposed to just having driveways as well as public versus private streets and the tradeoffs between parking and establishing public roads with sidewalks on both sides. The Planning Board asked for the developer to return with one to three options for the sidewalks including an option examining a full public street on the north-south roadway, and another redoing it slightly and establishing sidewalks on both sides.

The Board members generally liked the maritime sense and whimsical feel of the lighthouse element.

President Lynch noted that in summary, a discussion was held about the preliminary concepts, with a strong affirmation in some parts, and strong suggestions to do something different in other parts. He suggested that the Board entertain a motion to incorporate the concepts shared during the meeting, and bring back to the Board a design concept that incorporates those ideas as much as possible. He suggested that the Planning Board check to ensure their incorporation.

Mr. Thomas noted that the original condition of approval would be amended to require that all eight buildings come back to the Board for Design Review approval. No further action was taken.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Alameda Towne Center (South Shore) Sidewalk Quarterly Report

Mr. Thomas noted that the applicant submitted letters of preliminary agreement to the Planning and Building Department. The FEIR is not anticipated to be available until August.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Oral Status Report regarding the Oakland/Chinatown Advisory Committee (Board Member Mariani).

Board member Mariani was not in attendance to present this report.

- b. Oral Status Report regarding the Transportation subcommittee (Board Member Kohlstrand).

Board member Kohlstrand advised that the next meeting of the Pedestrian Task Force would be held June 26, 2007, from 6:00 – 7:30 p.m.

- c.. Oral Status Report regarding the Alameda Climate Protection Task Force (Board Member Cunningham).

Board member Cunningham noted that a meeting would be held on Wednesday, June 27, 2007, at the library for two hours.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 11:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Thomas, Secretary
City Planning Board

These minutes were approved at the July 9, 2007, Planning Board meeting. This meeting was audio and video taped.